

forced) moved to the north to counter major elements of the North Vietnamese Army moving across the Demilitarized Zone into the Province of Quang Tri; its units fought a series of savage battles against the enemy, repeatedly distinguishing themselves and, time and again, forcing the enemy to retreat back across the Demilitarized Zone. Imbued with an unrelenting combat spirit and initiative and undeterred by heavy hostile artillery and mortar fire, extremely difficult terrain, incessant heat and monsoon rains, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced), employing courageous ground, hell-borne and amphibious assaults, complemented by intense and accurate air, artillery and naval gunfire support, inflicted great losses on the enemy and denied him the political and military victory he sought to achieve at any cost. The outstanding courage, resourcefulness and aggressive fighting spirit of the officers and men of the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) in battle after battle against a well-equipped and well-trained enemy, often numerically superior in strength, and the great humanitarianism constantly shown to the peoples of the Republic of Vietnam, reflected great credit upon the Marine Corps and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

A TRAGIC CRUSADE

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we shall hear much this week about crusades, about who is really helping whom, and about means and ends.

We shall be saying these things in discussing the future of a program which began in hope and now may end in dismantling an agency to express our frustrations.

The New York Times today, in the following analytical editorial on the politics of crusading, should make us suspicious of the dismembering of OEO which has been proposed and of the "opportunity," which its proponents see in their crusade:

WHOSE "OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE"?

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameful performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, O.E.O. has had to cut off the \$30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of \$50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for preschool youngsters cannot be

made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program, which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start, now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now under way in the House.

Representatives Goodell of New York and Quile of Minnesota, the principal Republican spokesmen on the antipoverty bill, insist they are all for the aims of the program but just want to improve it. But their voting record makes their substitute "Opportunity Crusade bill" look suspect.

In every year since the antipoverty program started in 1964, Messrs. Goodell and Quile have voted against final passage, for recommitment and for every crippling amendment. The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Congress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

POVERTY AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, the mood of our House, and of the Federal Government, is one of economy. This sentiment is proper and laudable and should be encouraged in our consideration of the antipoverty program.

I am especially concerned that economy become a working element within the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. To that goal, I shall propose amendments to the OEO authorization bill to insure that consumer action programs be given proper emphasis in ending the barriers of poverty which encircle one-fifth of our Nation.

For the word "economy" meant, in its original Greek form, "household management." It is both in this original meaning and in its popular form, that the word is appropriate to my amendments. I shall propose a plan to improve both the efficiency of the dollars we devote to the antipoverty program and the efficiency with which the poorer consumer spends his dollars.

That the "poor pay more" remains one of the paradoxes of our time. What is wrong with a system where the poor, who, by definition, have less than others, has to pay more than his affluent neighbors for food, for clothing, for his housing, and even for his credit?

The facile answer is that the poor must learn to shop more carefully, to compare before he buys, to favor those merchants who are fair and to shun the unscrupulous, that he must, in short, exercise the judgment, initiative, and resourcefulness which some critics of the poor modestly think are the hallmarks of the solid middle class.

Mr. Speaker, my experience with both the American consumer and with human nature itself, suggest two flaws in this criticism of the poor: First, the middle-class consumer, is not such a great shopper himself, especially if unaided in his

purchasing; and second, it is fruitless, and self-deceiving, to think that the poor will learn through exhortation and admonition, instead of by education, and practice.

What shall I propose is a program of education, self-help, and good example. A comprehensive consumer action, as conceived under this program, would help the poorer consumer to use existing and new institutions to become a better consumer.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that a few poor consumers can learn these hard lessons in the marketplace alone, through trial and error and through profit and loss. But we err, I believe, in thinking that the extraordinary effort, the rare and inspiring example of the few which constitutes heroism in any field, should be presented to the poor as the norm for their education and development.

And just as we should not expect only heroes in the ghetto (although we welcome them as they arise) we should not expect only villains, though there will be several of these also.

We should expect simply that people will respond when they are given hope, which this consumer education program will give them.

We do not need to look farther back than last summer's riots to see what hopelessness yields nor beyond our more enlightened moments in this House, for example, when we enacted the antipoverty legislation, to see what great good may come when people have hope.

WALT W. ROSTOW: ANOTHER ALGER HISS?

(Mr. RARICK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 17 and 18, 1967, on pages H13556 and A5125, respectively, I commented on the security status of Walt W. Rostow, now special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, with particular reference to the case of Otto F. Otepka and the recently proposed Panama treaties of which he is alleged to be the "chief architect."

The latest information concerning Rostow is an extensively documented article in the November 3, 1967, issue of the Herald of Freedom, which recommends a "thorough investigation" of his background and activities and predicts that such inquiry "should produce more shocking revelations than the Alger Hiss case."

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would invite special attention to Rostow's close association with Harold R. Isaacs, a research associate for the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for the establishment, which Rostow is alleged to have obtained a grant of \$6 million from the CIA and which is now subsidized by the State and Defense Departments as well as the CIA. Isaacs was formerly an editor in Shanghai, China, and had close connections with Miss Agnes Smedley and others involved in the celebrated spy

RARICK, JOHN R. (Rep.)

Approved For Release 2005/01/05 : CIA-RDP75-00449R000700080003-7

ROSTOW, WALTER W.

ORG. 1 CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES